

REMARKS

In the Office Action mailed August 31, 2005, claims 1-112 stand pending, and claims 1-72 and 107-112 have been rejected. Upon entry of the instant amendment to the claims, claims 1, 22-23, 25, 27-28, 53, 107, and 112 have been amended; no new matter is deemed added by this amendment to the claims. Claims 73-106 are withdrawn in view of the Restriction Requirement which issued in this application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks.

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for courtesies extended to the undersigned representative in the interview of October 28, 2005. In the interview, claim 1 of the present invention was discussed, particularly in view of the references cited in the outstanding Office Action.

Claim Objections

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-27 and 112 are objected to because of informalities which have been corrected by the instant claim amendments to claims 1 and 112. Applicant thanks the Examiner for bringing these typographical errors to their attention.

Claim Rejections

35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph: Claim 27 has been amended to correct for the error regarding antecedent basis.

35 U.S.C. §102(b) and §103(a): Claims 1-3, 5-10, 14-25, 28-34, 39-50, 53-55, 57-59, 61-70 and 107-112 have been rejected under section 102(b) as being anticipated by WO 01/27501 A1. Claims 11-13, 36-38 and 56 are rejected as unpatentable under 103(a) as obvious and unpatentable over WO 01/27501 as applied to 1, 28, and 53 and further in view of Gore (U.S.P.N. 3,953,566). Claim 26, 27, 51, 52, 71, and 72 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over WO 01/027501 as applied to claims 2, and 53 and further in view of Hamilton (U.S.P.N. 5,486,010). Claims 4, 35 and 60 are rejected under 103(a) as unpatentable over WO 01/027501 A1.

The rejections to the claims are respectfully traversed. Applicant contends that the claims are patentable over the cited documents. Applicant submits that independent claims 1, 28, 53, 73, and 107 are patentable in view of the cited references, where none of the cited

references disclose or suggest the claimed gasket. Gaskets of the present invention comprise at least two joined tapes having upper and lower laminate layers, or upper and lower tape surfaces in the x-y plane of the tape (corresponding to a plane of ePTFE expansion). The at least two tapes, comprising side surfaces extending between upper and lower layers or surfaces, are aligned, side-by-side, along the side surfaces that extend in the longitudinal "x" direction of the tapes. The gaskets further comprise an air impermeable layer that extends in the "x" direction for the length of the tapes and is positioned between side surfaces of the aligned tapes. Where the dependent claims have all of the limitations of the independent claims, applicant deems these claims to be patentable for the reasons cited for the independent claims. Where none of the cited references describe gaskets according to the claimed invention, Applicant asserts that the invention is patentable.

The claims have been amended for purposes of clarity and applicant believes that all claims are in condition for allowance. Removal of the rejection to the claims, and prompt and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested. If any further action on the part of Applicant is deemed necessary, the Examiner should free to contact this office.

Respectfully submitted,



Dianne Burkhard, 41,650
W. L. Gore & Associates, Inc.
551 Paper Mill Road
P.O. Box 9206
Newark, DE 19714-9206
(302) 738-4880

Date: December 6, 2005